DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 279 CS 012 443

AUTHOR Gambrell, Linda B.; And Others
TITLE Elementary Students' Motivation to Read. Reading Research Report No. 52.
INSTITUTION National Reading Research Center, Athens, GA.; National Reading Research Center, College Park, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 96
CONTRACT 117A20007
NOTE 58p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Family Influence; Grade 3; Grade 5; *Reading Motivation; Reading Research; *Self Concept; *Student Motivation; Text Structure
IDENTIFIERS Maryland; *Motivation to Read Profile

ABSTRACT

This study explored 330 third- and fifth-grade Maryland students' motivation to read using the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP). The first part of the MRP, a Likert-type, self-report, group-administered questionnaire, was completed by all students. The second part of the MRP, the Conversational Interview, was individually administered to a random sample of 48 students. Results provided support for the importance of two dimensions of motivation to read: self-concept as a reader and value of reading. In addition, the Conversational Interview revealed insights about the influence of text type, school, and home factors on motivation to read. Taken together, findings suggest that motivation to read is linked to four key features of literacy learning: access, choice, familiarity, and social interaction. (Contains 77 references and 7 tables of data. Appendixes provide an information sheet, a self-concept as a reader subscale, a value of reading subscale, an 8-item list of references cited for reading survey item generation, the Conversational Interview, and teacher directions for administration of the reading survey.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 395 279

Elementary Students' Motivation to Read

Linda B. Gambrell
Rose Marie Codling
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Martin Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS012443

NRRC
National
Reading Research
Center

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 52
Winter 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NRRC

National Reading Research Center

Elementary Students' Motivation to Read

Linda B. Gambrell
Rose Marie Codling
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Martin Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

READING RESEARCH REPORT NO. 52
Winter 1996

The work reported herein is a National Reading Research Project of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland. It was supported under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program (PR/AWARD NO. 117A20007) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Reading Research Center, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.

NRRC National Reading Research Center

Executive Committee
Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
University of Georgia
John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
University of Maryland College Park
James F. Baumann, Associate Director
University of Georgia
Patricia S. Koskinen, Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Jamie Lynn Metsala, Interim Associate Director
University of Maryland College Park
Nancy B. Mizelle, Assistant Director
University of Georgia
Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia
John F. O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Cynthia R. Hynd
University of Georgia
Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore County
Betty Shockley
Clarke County School District, Athens, Georgia
Linda DeGroff
University of Georgia

Publications Editors

Research Reports and Perspectives
Linda DeGroff, Editor
University of Georgia
James V. Hoffman, Associate Editor
University of Texas at Austin
Mariam Jean Dreher, Associate Editor
University of Maryland College Park
Instructional Resources
Lee Galda, *University of Georgia*
Research Highlights
William G. Holliday
University of Maryland College Park
Policy Briefs
James V. Hoffman
University of Texas at Austin
Videos
Shawn M. Glynn, *University of Georgia*

NRRC Staff
Barbara F. Howard, Office Manager
Kathy B. Davis, Senior Secretary
University of Georgia

Barbara A. Neitzey, Administrative Assistant
Valerie Tyra, Accountant
University of Maryland College Park

National Advisory Board
Phyllis W. Aldrich
Saratoga Warren Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Saratoga Springs, New York
Arthur N. Applebee
State University of New York, Albany
Ronald S. Brandt
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Marsha T. DeLain
Delaware Department of Public Instruction
Carl A. Grant
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Walter Kintsch
University of Colorado at Boulder
Robert L. Linn
University of Colorado at Boulder
Luis C. Moll
University of Arizona
Carol M. Santa
School District No. 5
Kalispell, Montana
Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education
Louise Cherry Wilkinson
Rutgers University

Production Editor
Katherine P. Hutchison
University of Georgia

Dissemination Coordinator
Jordana E. Rich
University of Georgia

Text Formatter
Ann Marie Vanstone
University of Georgia

NRRC - University of Georgia
318 Aderhold
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674 Fax: (706) 542-3678
INTERNET: NRRC@uga.cc.uga.edu

NRRC - University of Maryland College Park
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 405-8035 Fax: (301) 314-9625
INTERNET: NRRC@umail.umd.edu

About the National Reading Research Center

The National Reading Research Center (NRRC) is funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct research on reading and reading instruction. The NRRC is operated by a consortium of the University of Georgia and the University of Maryland College Park in collaboration with researchers at several institutions nationwide.

The NRRC's mission is to discover and document those conditions in homes, schools, and communities that encourage children to become skilled, enthusiastic, lifelong readers. NRRC researchers are committed to advancing the development of instructional programs sensitive to the cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors that affect children's success in reading. NRRC researchers from a variety of disciplines conduct studies with teachers and students from widely diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classrooms. Research projects deal with the influence of family and family-school interactions on the development of literacy; the interaction of sociocultural factors and motivation to read; the impact of literature-based reading programs on reading achievement; the effects of reading strategies instruction on comprehension and critical thinking in literature, science, and history; the influence of innovative group participation structures on motivation and learning; the potential of computer technology to enhance literacy; and the development of methods and standards for alternative literacy assessments.

The NRRC is further committed to the participation of teachers as full partners in its research. A better understanding of how teachers view the development of literacy, how they use knowledge from research, and how they approach change in the classroom is crucial to improving instruction. To further this understanding, the NRRC conducts school-based research in which teachers explore their own philosophical and pedagogical orientations and trace their professional growth.

Dissemination is an important feature of NRRC activities. Information on NRRC research appears in several formats. *Research Reports* communicate the results of original research or synthesize the findings of several lines of inquiry. They are written primarily for researchers studying various areas of reading and reading instruction. The *Perspective Series* presents a wide range of publications, from calls for research and commentary on research and practice to first-person accounts of experiences in schools. *Instructional Resources* include curriculum materials, instructional guides, and materials for professional growth, designed primarily for teachers.

For more information about the NRRC's research projects and other activities, or to have your name added to the mailing list, please contact:

Donna E. Alvermann, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
318 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-7125
(706) 542-3674

John T. Guthrie, Co-Director
National Reading Research Center
3216 J. M. Patterson Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-8035

NRRC Editorial Review Board

Peter Afflerbach
University of Maryland College Park

Jane Agee
University of Georgia

JoBeth Allen
University of Georgia

Janice F. Almasi
University of Buffalo–SUNY

Patty Anders
University of Arizona

Harriette Arrington
University of Kentucky

Marlia Banning
University of Utah

Jill Bartoli
Elizabethtown College

Eurydice Bauer
University of Georgia

Janet Benton
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Irene Blum
Pine Springs Elementary School
Falls Church, Virginia

David Bloome
Amherst College

John Borkowski
Notre Dame University

Fenice Boyd
University of Georgia

Karen Bromley
Binghamton University

Martha Carr
University of Georgia

Suzanne Clewell
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Maryland

Joan Coley
Western Maryland College

Michelle Commeyras
University of Georgia

Linda Cooper
Shaker Heights City Schools
Shaker Heights, Ohio

Karen Costello
Connecticut Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

Jim Cunningham
Gibsonville, North Carolina

Karin Dahl
Ohio State University

Marcia Delany
Wilkes County Public Schools
Washington, Georgia

Lynne Diaz-Rico
California State University-San Bernardino

Ann Egan-Robertson
Amherst College

Jim Flood
San Diego State University

Dana Fox
University of Arizona

Linda Gambrell
University of Maryland College Park

Mary Graham
McLean, Virginia

Rachel Grant
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Guzzetti
Arizona State University

Frances Hancock
Concordia College of Saint Paul, Minnesota

Kathleen Heubach
University of Georgia

Sally Hudson-Ross
University of Georgia

Cynthia Hynd
University of Georgia

Gay Ivey
University of Georgia

David Jardine
University of Calgary

Robert Jimenez
University of Oregon

Michelle Kelly
University of Utah

James King
University of South Florida

Kate Kirby
Gwinnett County Public Schools
Lawrenceville, Georgia

Linda Labbo
University of Georgia

Michael Law
University of Georgia

Donald T. Leu
Syracuse University

Susan Lytle
University of Pennsylvania

Bert Mangino
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Mazzoni
Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Dacey McCann
University of Maryland College Park

Sarah McCarthey
University of Texas at Austin

Veda McClain
University of Georgia

Lisa McFalls
University of Georgia

Randy McGinnis
University of Maryland

Mike McKenna
Georgia Southern University

Barbara Michalove
Fowler Drive Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Elizabeth B. Moje
University of Utah

Lesley Morrow
Rutgers University

Bruce Murray
University of Georgia

Susan Neuman
Temple University

John O'Flahavan
University of Maryland College Park

Marilyn Ohlhausen-McKinney
University of Nevada

Penny Oldfather
University of Georgia

Barbara M. Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

Stephen Phelps
Buffalo State College

Mike Pickle
Georgia Southern University

Amber T. Prince
Berry College

Gaoyin Qian
Lehman College-CUNY

Tom Reeves
University of Georgia

Lenore Ringler
New York University

Mary Roe
University of Delaware

Nadeen T. Ruiz
California State University-
Sacramento

Olivia Saracho
University of Maryland College Park

Paula Schwanenflugel
University of Georgia

Robert Serpell
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Betty Shockley
Fowler Drive Elementary School
Athens, Georgia

Wayne H. Slater
University of Maryland College Park

Margaret Smith
Las Vegas, Nevada

Susan Sonnenschein
University of Maryland Baltimore
County

Bernard Spodek
University of Illinois

Bettie St. Pierre
University of Georgia

Steve Stahl
University of Georgia

Roger Stewart
University of Wyoming

Anne P. Sweet
Office of Educational Research
and Improvement

Louise Tomlinson
University of Georgia

Bruce VanSledright
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Walker
Eastern Montana University-Billings

Louise Waynant
Prince George's County Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dera Weaver
Athens Academy
Athens, Georgia

Jane West
Agnes Scott College

Renee Weisburg
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Allen Wigfield
University of Maryland College Park

Shelley Wong
University of Maryland College Park

Josephine Peyton Young
University of Georgia

Hallic Yupp
California State University

About the Authors

Linda B. Gambrell is Associate Dean of Faculty Research and Professor of Curriculum at the University of Maryland. She is also a principal investigator with the National Reading Research Center and a former classroom teacher and reading teacher at the elementary school level. In recent years, Dr. Gambrell's research has focused on comprehension processes and the role of children's literature in the reading program. She has published in *The Reading Teacher*, *Journal of Reading*, and *Reading Research Quarterly*. She has served as co-editor of the *Journal of Reading Behavior* and on the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association.

Rose Marie Codling is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Maryland. She is a former classroom teacher and research assistant at the National Reading Research Center. She currently teaches undergraduate courses in reading methods. Her research interests are in the areas of motivation and reading disability. Ms. Codling is a member of the International Reading Association. She has published in and serves on the editorial advisory board of *Literacy: Issues and Practices*, the journal of the State of Maryland International Reading Association Council.

Barbara Martin Palmer, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Education at Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmitsburg, MD. Previously, Dr. Palmer taught high school Spanish. As a Reading Specialist, she taught reading and study skills at a variety of levels. In addition to literacy motivation, her research interests include comprehension, metacognition, and teacher education. Presently, Dr. Palmer serves on the Board of Directors of the College Reading Association, sits on several review boards, and edits *Literacy: Issues and Practices*, the journal of the State of Maryland International Reading Association Council. Her publications have appeared in the *National Reading Conference Yearbook*, *Educational Psychologist*, *Contemporary Psychology*, and *The Reading Teacher*.

National Reading Research Center
Universities of Georgia and Maryland
Reading Research Report No. 52
Winter 1996

Elementary Students' Motivation to Read

Linda B. Gambrell
Rose Marie Codling
University of Maryland College Park

Barbara Martin Palmer
Mount Saint Mary's College

Abstract. *Educators at all levels acknowledge the importance of motivation in the acquisition of literacy. Current research and theory support the notion that the depth and breadth of literacy learning is influenced by a variety of motivational factors (Ford, 1992; McCombs, 1991; Oldfather, 1993). There is a need, therefore, to more fully understand the factors that enable children to acquire the motivation to develop into active, engaged readers.*

This study explored third- and fifth-grade students' (N = 330) motivation to read using the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP; Gambrell, Palmer, Codling & Mazzoni, in press). The MRP consists of two parts. The Reading Survey is a Likert-type, self-report, group-administered questionnaire which was completed by all students. It consists of two subscales, one focusing on Self-Concept As a Reader and the other focusing on Value of Reading. The second part of the MRP is the Conversational Interview which was individually administered to a random sample of 48 students.

The results of this study provided support for the importance and relevance of two dimensions of motivation to read: self-concept as a reader and value of reading. In addition, the Conversational Interview revealed insights about the influence of text type, school, and home factors on motivation to read. Taken together, the results of this study suggest that motivation to read is linked to four key features of literacy learning: access, choice, familiarity, and social interaction.

Elementary Students' Motivation to Read

Motivation is currently being recognized in the educational literature as a powerful and useful construct (Csikszentmihalyi, 1991; Ford, 1992; McCombs, 1991; Wigfield & Asher, 1984). However, motivation has numerous and competing conceptualizations. For example, Kuhl (1986) used the term to designate all latent and aroused goal states which drive, orient, and select behavior at any given point in time. Wittrock (1986) defined motivation to be the process of initiating, sustaining, and directing activity. Maehr (1976) defined con-

tinuing motivation as the tendency to return to and continue working on tasks away from the instructional context in which they were initially confronted. Most motivational theorists identify two types of motivation: extrinsic and intrinsic (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Lepper, 1988). Behavior is said to be extrinsically motivated when it is done to satisfy some external goal, such as doing well on a spelling test so as to earn the privilege of a Saturday outing. Intrinsically motivated behavior, on the other hand, is characterized by a desire to engage in an activity because doing so brings personal satisfaction.

In this study, motivation is defined as goal-directed behavior that is mediated by social, cognitive, and affective factors. Motivation to read, then, is more than effortful activity or time spent on the task (Corno & Mandinach, 1983), and is reflected in how children think about themselves as readers and how they think about reading tasks and activities.

In the past, reading motivation research on elementary students focused more generally on attitudes toward reading and specific variables such as gender differences, grade-level differences, and to a lesser extent, differences according to reading proficiency level. A number of studies have revealed that girls have more positive attitudes toward reading than do boys (Anderson, Tollefson, & Gilbert, 1985; Greaney & Neuman, 1990; Hansen, 1969; Johnson, 1973; Ross & Fletcher, 1989; Stevenson & Newman, 1986); that younger children have more positive attitudes toward reading than do older students (Anderson et al., 1985; Greaney & Neuman, 1990; Ishikawa, 1985; Parker & Paradis, 1986; Saracho & Dayton, 1991); and that less proficient readers have less positive attitudes toward reading than do more proficient readers, a disparity which appears to increase with age (McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth, in press). Therefore, there is a need to direct our efforts to more fully understand how children acquire and sustain the motivation to become engaged, highly motivated readers.

Historical Perspectives on Motivation

Psychologists, researchers, and educators have long been interested in the role of motivation in learning. The early psychoanalytic theorists, such as Freud (1901/1951), posited that motivation is related to basic biological drives or instincts that cause individuals to behave in certain ways. The basic tenet that internal forces influence human behavior is still recognized in contemporary theories of motivation (Ford, 1992). Behaviorists, such as Skinner (1953), later viewed individuals as "blank slates" on which experiences (external events) conditioned and shaped behavior. While this theoretical view does not recognize cognition and affective experience, it does highlight important principles about how feedback to the learner can influence the selection of goals and the means used to attain those goals. Later, psychologists such as Rogers (1961) and Maslow (1970) put forth the view that individuals have an inborn propensity for growth, which is fostered through learning, natural development, and significant others. These theorists focused attention on motives associated with learning and their work resulted in the development of "self" theories, which emphasize the

strong and pervasive human need for positive social- and self-evaluations. Recently, cognitive, sociocognitive, and social theorists have extended and refined these earlier theories, and more integrative conceptualizations of motivation have emerged in the literature (Ford, 1992; McCombs, 1989).

Contemporary Views of Motivation

Researchers have recently begun to focus on motivation as a phenomenon of "thinking" as well as "feeling" (Corno & Snow, 1986; Weiner, 1985; Winne, 1985). Unlike behavioral theories which focus on reinforcement contingencies in the environment, the more contemporary, cognition-based theories of motivation see thoughts and feelings as mediators of behavior (Stipek, 1988). In this view, an individual's *interpretation* of the environment is more salient than environmental factors per se. Self-perception, based on these cognitive interpretations, is a key factor in motivation.

A number of contemporary theories of motivation emphasize the importance of self-perception in learning (Dweck, 1986; McCombs, 1989; Weiner, 1990). Motivation is viewed as being based on the individual's learned beliefs about their worth, abilities, or competencies. A vast body of research (Bandura, 1989; Covington, 1985; Dweck, 1986; Weiner, 1990) supports the contention that learned self-beliefs, expectations, and goals are factors that affect motivation and performance.

Recent research has demonstrated that literacy learning is influenced by a variety of motivational factors (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Eccles, 1983; Ford, 1992; Kuhl, 1986; Lepper, 1988; Maehr, 1976; McCombs, 1991; Wigfield & Asher, 1984). Two factors, self-perceived competence and task value appear to be major determinants of motivation and task engagement. Eccles (1983) advanced an "expectancy-value" theory of motivation which states that motivation is strongly influenced by one's expectation of success or failure at a task as well as the "value" or relative attractiveness the individual sees in the task. The expectancy component of this model includes students' beliefs about their own competency. There is a body of research that supports the notion that students who believe they are capable and competent are more likely to perform in such a manner than students who do not hold such beliefs (Paris & Oka, 1986; Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990; Schunk, 1985). The value component of Eccles' model includes goals and beliefs about both the importance of and interest in the task. Research suggests that students who perceive a task as important and interesting will engage in the task in a more planful and effortful manner (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Elliott, 1983; Paris & Oka, 1986).

The work of other motivation theorists, such as Ford (1992) and Winne (1985), has been grounded in the expectancy-value theory. An important component of Ford's (1992) Motivational Systems Theory (MST) is the role of personal agency beliefs which are reflected in an individual's capability beliefs and context beliefs. Capability beliefs are self-evaluations about whether one has the abilities needed to attain a goal, while context beliefs are evaluations of whether the environment or context will facilitate goal attainment. Taken together, capability and context beliefs provide the

individual with information which guides decisions about initiating, maintaining, or avoiding learning activities.

Personal goals, another important component of MST, represent desired future outcomes. Pursuit of goals depends upon their attainability and their relevance and importance to the individual. Thus, the clarity and saliency of personal values influences an individual's motivation to initiate or sustain a particular activity. According to Ford (1992), emotional processes provide an individual with evaluative information about personal goals. Emotional processes result in an "energization" of behavior which is reflected in what "turns someone on" or "turns them off," what one likes or does not like, what one values or does not value.

The term "personal goal" is emphasized because the goals which direct an individual's activity are always within the person (Weiner, 1990). However, an individual's goals or reasons for engaging in an activity are often contextual in that people will adopt many of the goals shared by other individuals in their environment as well as those assigned by authority figures or significant others.

MST suggests that people will attempt to attain goals they value and perceive as achievable in terms of the context and their capabilities. This notion is consistent with the contention of Winne and Marx (1982) that a positive state of motivation is a necessary condition for learning. In keeping with Winne's (1985) theory of motivation, the "idealized" reader feels competent as a reader, values reading, chooses to read, and engages in reading activities with intensity.

The broad purposes of the present study were to investigate elementary students' motivation to read and to develop an instrument for measuring motivation to read based on current motivation theory. The study was specifically designed to overcome some of the limitations of existing motivation research. First, much of the research to date on motivation has relied solely on survey data,with little emphasis on individual differences (Harter, 1981; Henk & Melnick, 1995; McKenna & Kear, 1990). This is not a trivial concern given that motivation to read may be influenced by a large number of variables which can fluctuate across time and context. The Motivation to Read Profile (MRP), an instrument that was designed for use in this study (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, in press), consists of a Reading Survey and a Conversational Interview which were used to collect data at four points across the school year.

A second methodological concern is that prior research on elementary students' motivation to read has primarily focused on motivation related to the reading of narrative text and has not specifically addressed the issues related to the reading of expository text (Henk & Melnick, 1995; McKenna & Kear, 1990). In this study, the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview were designed to focus on students' reading of narrative as well as expository text.

A third problem inherent in much of the motivation research in reading is that reading ability is a confounding variable, and as such, proficient, higher-ability readers are typically identified as "highly motivated" while less proficient, lower-ability readers are identified

as "less motivated." We know that this conceptualization is inaccurate (Roettger, 1980), and that there are proficient readers who are not motivated to read, just as there are less proficient readers who are highly motivated to read. Therefore, in the present study, a stratified random sampling procedure was used to select informants for the conversational interviews to assure representation of highly-motivated and less-motivated students across reading proficiency levels.

The Motivation to Read Profile (MRP) developed for this study was based on Ford's (1992) Motivational Systems Theory and the expectancy-value theory first conceptualized by Eccles (1983) and later refined by Pintrich and DeGroot (1990). Given the emphasis on self-concept and task value in current theories of motivation, it seems important to explore these dimensions as they relate to children's motivation to read. It also seems important to explore these motivation issues utilizing research techniques that are congruent with current knowledge about the social and contextual nature of literacy acquisition (Silverman, 1993).

Method

Participants and Setting

Subjects for this study were third- and fifth-grade students from four schools in two Maryland counties. All teachers and third- and fifth-grade students in the 30 classrooms were invited to participate. Data from three classrooms were omitted from the final analysis because guidelines for administering the Reading Survey section of the MRP were not followed. The final sample consisted of 330 third- and fifth-grade students from 27 classrooms.

One county was described by the participating school principals as agriculturally-based with growing bedroom communities. The other county was described as a growing metropolitan area by one principal and as rural, with pockets of bedroom communities, by the other principal. Though school principals indicated that a range of socioeconomic levels was represented, every school was described as middle class, with approximately 23% of students eligible for the federal free-lunch program. All four schools housed grades K–5, but student populations ranged in number from 340 to 820. There were 8 third-grade and 9 fifth-grade classrooms in County A; 7 third-grade and 6 fifth-grade classrooms in County B. Schools in both counties were predominantly Caucasian, with County A reporting a minority population of approximately 30% and County B reporting approximately 9% minorities. Table 1 shows the breakdown of the minority population per school as reported by school administrators.

At the end of the sixth week of school, teachers were asked to provide information about their reading program and students on a designated information sheet (see Appendix A). With regard to the reading program description, teachers were provided a list of seven descriptors (Gambrell, 1992) and asked to indicate which descriptor best matched their reading program. If the basic program was supplemented in some way, teachers indicated the way in which they individually modified their program. Teachers reported using a variety of instructional techniques, including

Table 1. Minority Population Reported by School Administrators

	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American
County A			
School 1	15%	5%	5%
School 2	15%	10%	10%
County B			
School 1	5%	1%	1%
School 2	5%	5%	1%

Table 2. Teacher Descriptions of Basic Reading Program

	Grade 3	Grade 5
County A:		
School 1		
Basal program supplemented by literature	3	3
Children's literature supplemented by basal	1	1
School 2		
Basal program supplemented by literature	0	0
Children's literature supplemented by curriculum integration	2	4
County B:		
School 1		
Basal program supplemented by literature	1	1
Basal program supplemented by literature and curriculum integration	3	3
School 2		
Basal program	1	0
Basal supplemented by literature	2	1
Children's literature supplemented by basal	0	1

those traditionally seen as reflecting meaning and skills emphases. Table 2 presents the teacher descriptions of their basic reading program.

The use of teacher ratings of students' reading proficiency and motivational levels was an important feature of this study. According to Marsh, Smith, and Barnes (1983), these

ratings are reasonable indicators of student performance and motivation because elementary classroom teachers: (a) spend the entire school day with their students and therefore have considerable contact with them; (b) are exposed to a wide variety of children, usually in heterogeneously-grouped classrooms, as in this study; (c) have experience in making professional judgments about individual students; and (d) are likely to have a variety of opportunities to observe behaviors relevant to both reading achievement and motivation to read. There is a body of recent research that indicates that classroom teachers are reasonably accurate and reliable in estimating student achievement (Coladarci, 1986; Egan & Archer, 1985; Hoge & Butcher, 1984). In addition, prior research has provided evidence of substantial agreement between teacher ratings of students' self-concepts and self-reports by students (Perkins, 1958; Phillips, 1963).

At the conclusion of the sixth week of the academic year, teachers were asked to indicate the reading proficiency level of their students (above-grade, on-grade, or below-grade level) and, within each reading proficiency level, to identify two motivated and two unmotivated students. Throughout this paper, we use the terms "highly motivated" and "less motivated" in keeping with the theoretical orientation of McCombs (1991) that all students are motivated and it is the relative strength of the motivational state that is of interest. Informal conversations with teachers in the participating schools suggested, however, that the terms "highly motivated" and "unmotivated" would be less ambiguous on the information sheet and more useful in making judgments about students' motivation to read. Teachers in this study did not report any concerns about making these judgments.

Materials

The MRP consists of two basic instruments: The Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview. Because the MRP combines information from a group-administered survey instrument with an individual interview, it is a useful tool for exploring more fully the personal dimensions of students' reading motivation.

Reading Survey

The Reading Survey is a Likert-type, self-report, group-administered instrument. The survey consists of two subscales which were developed to assess students' motivation to read. Each subscale focused on a different dimension of motivation: self-concept as a reader or value of reading.

The Self-Concept subscale was entitled "How do you feel about your reading?" for classroom use (see Appendix B). It consists of 10 items. For each item there is a stem and 3 or 4 response options. In order to avoid repetition in the presentation of the response alternatives and to control for the threat of "response set" (i.e., children selecting the same responses for each item), some response alternatives proceed from most positive to least positive while others are ordered in the opposite way.

The Value of Reading subscale was entitled "What do you think about reading?" for classroom use (see Appendix C). It consists of 15

items that assess the relative value students place on reading. Some items provide two response options, some provide three options, though the majority provide four options. Again, the response alternatives were varied in order to avoid response set.

Initial item selection was based on a review of the literature on instruments used in prior research and studies of interviews with elementary students about reading. (Appendix D provides a list of instruments referenced during the item generation phase of the study.) The criteria for item selection and development for the survey instrument included: (a) applicability to grades one through six; (b) applicability to all teaching approaches and materials; (c) suitability for group administration; and (d) accuracy in reflecting the appropriate dimension of motivation (i.e., self-concept or value).

An initial pool of survey items was developed based on the criteria described above. Three experienced classroom teachers, who were also graduate students in reading, critiqued over 100 items for their construct validity in assessing students' self-concept or value of reading. The items that received 100% agreement by the teachers were then compiled. The agreed upon items were then submitted to four classroom teachers who were asked to sort the items into three categories of function: (1) measures self-concept; (2) measures value of reading; and (3) not sure or questionable. Only those items that received 100% trait agreement were selected for inclusion on the Reading Survey instrument. Final versions of each subscale were field tested with two or three third- and fifth-grade students, resulting in minor rewording of several items.

Conversational Interview

An interview was developed for the purpose of engaging students in conversations designed to probe their motivation to read (see Appendix E). The methodology of this study was guided by the work of Burgess (1980) and his conceptualization of unstructured interviews as conversations, and Silverman's (1993) theory of interactionism. According to Burgess (1980), interviews are encounters between human beings trying to understand one another. In his view, conversational interviews should be treated as social events based on mutual participation by the interviewer and the informant. Conversational interviews are based on a sustained relationship between the informant and the researcher and therefore, provide greater depth than other interview techniques. While conversational interviews are scripted, deviations from the script are anticipated and expected as the interviewer and the informant actively construct their social worlds (Baker, 1984). With respect to the interpretation of responses, Silverman's (1993) theory of interactionism suggests that we need not interpret responses simply as true or false reports on reality; rather, we can treat such responses as displays of perspectives. The primary purpose of the conversational interview is to generate data which give an authentic insight into experiences. In the present study, conversational interviews were used because they allow children to use their unique ways of defining literacy learning, and they allow children to raise ideas and issues that are not contained in the script (Denzin, 1970).

The Conversational Interview consists of open-ended questions about general and specific reading experiences, home and school reading, and narrative and informational reading. There are 36 questions, several of which are designed to corroborate information gleaned from the Reading Survey. Prior to administration, the Conversational Interview was pilot tested with individual third- and fifth-grade students not involved in the study. This resulted in minor changes in wording and the development of guidelines for administration.

Procedure

Data were collected for the study at four points across the school year. After the teachers involved in the study were debriefed about the purposes and procedures of the study, the Reading Survey section of the MRP was administered in the late fall. The Conversational Interview was conducted in early winter and in the spring. Finally, the Reading Survey was administered in the spring for the purpose of establishing instrument reliability.

Reading Survey

The Reading Survey was administered by the classroom teachers in November and the following April. Prior to the start of the study, standardized directions were demonstrated by one of the researchers at an informational meeting. Teachers also received written directions and were encouraged by the researchers to adhere to the directions in order to maintain fidelity of administration (see Appendix F).

The subscales of the Reading Survey were administered as regular instructional activities by classroom teachers on 2 days during the same week. The order of administration of the two subscales varied across classes to eliminate order effects. Directions were read aloud to the students and carefully explained. Students were then asked to follow along as each item was read aloud by the teacher. This was done to remove reading ability as a possible confounding variable. After reading a statement, students were instructed to choose the best response from those available and darken the space preceding the selected answer.

Conversational Interview

Interview data were collected in November–December and March–April. The random sample of 48 children were interviewed in a quiet area of the school, generally a teacher resource room or corner of the library. The children were individually interviewed in two 30-min sessions. One session was devoted to a discussion of narrative text reading; the other to reading for information. The order of the interviews was counter-balanced, with one-half of the students at each grade level first responding to the narrative questions while one-half responded to the expository questions. The order was reversed for the second session.

Data Analysis

Data for this study were derived from the Motivation to Read Profile (MRP). The MRP consists of two sections: the Reading Survey

and the Conversational Interview. The data analysis procedures based on the Reading Survey (self-concept as a reader subscale and value of reading subscale) will be presented first, followed by the data analysis procedures for the Conversational Interview.

Reading Survey

To measure the internal consistency of the Reading Survey, Cronbach's alpha statistic was calculated for each of the two subscales for grades 3 and 5 (Cronbach, 1951, 1988). Cronbach reliability coefficients were as follows: Self-Concept as a Reader, third grade = .70, fifth grade = .74; and Value of Reading, third grade = .69, fifth grade = .77. In addition, pretest and posttest reliability coefficients were calculated for each subscale (Self-Concept as a Reader = .68, Value of Reading = .70), confirming the moderately high reliability of the instrument.

The data from the Reading Survey were analyzed in several ways. First, means and standard deviations were calculated for the total scores on the two subscales. Next, means and standard deviations were calculated for each item on the subscales. Third, multivariate analysis of variance procedures were conducted with the Self-Concept as a Reader subscale and the Value of Reading subscale as the dependent variables, and grade (3rd and 5th) and reading proficiency level (above, on, and below grade level) serving as independent variables. When appropriate, Tukey HSD multiple comparison tests were conducted.

Conversational Interview

In order to validate the MRP, questions which tapped similar information on both the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview were identified. There was corroborating information available from interview items for 55% of the items on the Reading Survey (3 items on the Self-Concept as a Reader subscale and 8 items on the Value of Reading subscale). Consistency between the sections of the MRP was determined from the responses of two motivated and two unmotivated students randomly selected from each grade level. Two raters independently compared each student's responses to related items, with an interrater agreement of .87. Consistency was measured by comparing the students' responses on the Reading Survey items with their responses to the Conversational Interview questions. The consistency across the two measures was .70.

Three separate and distinct analyses were conducted with the data derived from the Conversational Interviews. All protocols were transcribed by question so that responses to each question could be scrutinized for patterns and themes. First, the interview data were analyzed with regard to responses that were relevant to the two constructs measured by the Reading Survey (self-concept as a reader and value of reading). Second, where appropriate, responses were tabulated and frequencies were calculated in an attempt to reveal patterns of responses. Third, the constant comparative method of analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) was used for conceptualizing and categorizing the data through open coding. Two researchers read all responses to each question and identified emerging patterns and categories of responses.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Items on Self-Concept as a Reader Subscale

Item	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Four-point Likert-scale items:				
1. My friends think I am _____.	3.30	.784	3.15	.745
2. When I am in a group talking about stories, I _____.	2.74	1.01	2.56	.892
4. When I come to a word I don't know, I can _____.	3.53	.595	3.40	.661
5. When I read out loud I feel _____.	3.14	.952	3.04	1.04
6. When I am reading by myself, I understand _____.	3.66	.583	3.69	.583
7. I am _____.	3.36	.798	3.22	.752
8. I worry about what other kids think about my reading _____.	1.94	1.05	1.75	.807
9. When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read, I _____.	3.37	.737	3.30	.734
10. Reading is _____.	3.49	.719	3.54	.703
Three-point Likert-scale items:				
3. I read _____.	2.16	.583	2.05	.499

Results

The findings of this study were derived from statistical analyses conducted on student responses to the items on the Reading Survey and an interpretive analysis of student responses to the Conversational Interview. First, the results relative to performance on the Reading Survey will be presented, then the results of the analyses of the interview responses will be described.

Reading Survey

In this section the results are presented in the following order. First, items or clusters of items were identified for each subscale in order to determine what third and fifth graders felt most positively about with respect to self-concept and value of reading. Next, grade level and reading proficiency level differences will be discussed.

Subscales

Self-Concept as a Reader. The Self-Concept as a Reader subscale contained 10 items (see Table 3). Nine items were based on a 4-point Likert scale (#s 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10) and one item was based on a 3-point Likert scale (# 3). The mean scores for the items based on a 4-point scale were rank ordered to reveal the most positively rated items. The students at both third- and fifth-grade levels responded most positively about their ability to understand what they read (item #6, 3rd grade M = 3.66, 5th grade M = 3.69). The next most positively rated items were about reading being an "easy" task (item #10, 3rd grade M = 3.49, 5th grade M = 3.54) and their ability to figure out unfamiliar words (item #4, 3rd grade M = 3.53, 5th grade M = 3.40). The 3-point Likert-scale item reflected students' feelings about themselves as readers relative to their peers (item #3, 3rd grade M = 2.16, 5th grade M = 2.05).

Value of Reading. The Value of Reading subscale contained 15 items (see Table 4). Ten items were based on a 4-point Likert scale (#s 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15); two were based on a 3-point Likert scale (#s 4 and 6); and three were forced choice (#s 1, 8, and 10). The mean scores of the items based on a 4-point scale were rank ordered to reveal the most positively rated items. The responses for both third- and fifth-grade students were similar. The third-grade students responded most positively to two items; one about the number of books in their house (item #12, M = 3.72) and one about receiving books as gifts (item #15, M = 3.71). The fifth-grade students responded most positively to the items about the number of books in the house (item #12, M = 3.63); other people in their house reading (item #13, M = 3.41), and receiving books as gifts (item #15, M = 3.41). Of the 3-point items, both third- and fifth-graders responded most positively to the item about the importance of reading (item #6, 3rd grade M = 2.83, 5th grade M = 2.86).

The forced-choice items presented students with a choice between reading and some other activity. When faced with an onerous task like cleaning their rooms, students indicated a preference for reading (item #8, 3rd grade M = 1.82, 5th grade M = 1.86). However, even when the alternative to reading was watching TV (item #1, 3rd grade M = 1.65, 5th grade M = 1.47) or getting a new game (item #10, 3rd grade M = 1.66, 5th grade M = 1.54), many students still chose reading as the preferred activity.

Grade Level and Reading Proficiency Level Differences

Multivariate analysis of variance procedures on the two subscales (self-concept and

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Items on Value of Reading Subscale

Item	Grade 3		Grade 5	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Four-point Likert-scale items:				
2. I would like for my teacher to read books out loud to the class _____.	3.51	.796	3.07	.862
3. I tell my friends about good books I read _____.	2.79	1.07	2.76	.901
5. Reading a book is something I like to do _____.	3.55	.623	3.35	.685
7. People who read a lot are _____.	3.54	.633	3.28	.637
9. I think libraries are _____.	3.54	.703	3.05	.870
11. I think reading is _____.	3.26	.992	2.94	.965
12. In my house, I have _____.	3.72	.650	3.63	.707
13. Other people in my house _____.	3.41	.714	3.41	.623
14. When I grow up I will spend _____.	3.37	.830	3.14	.695
15. When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel _____.	3.71	.618	3.41	.754
Three-point Likert-scale items:				
4. My best friends think reading is _____.	2.35	.702	2.22	.572
6. Knowing how to read well is _____.	2.83	.418	2.86	.378
Forced-choice items:				
1. In my free time, I would rather _____.	1.65	.480	1.47	.501
8. I would rather _____.	1.82	.431	1.86	.345
10. I would rather have _____.	1.66	.474	1.54	.499

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for Third and Fifth Grade on the Total Reading Survey

Subscale	Grade 3	Grade 5
Self-Concept as a Reader (Maximum score = 43)	(n = 159) M = 29.66 SD = 3.91	(n = 146) M = 28.79 SD = 3.98
Value of Reading (Maximum score = 52)	(n = 157) M = 44.61 SD = 5.11	(n = 148) M = 42.04* SD = 4.95

*$p < .001$

value) revealed statistically significant main effects for grade (3rd and 5th) and reading proficiency level (above, on, and below). No statistically significant interactions were found.

Grade level differences. Statistically significant differences were found between third- and fifth-grade on the Value of Reading subscale, $F(1, 278) = 11.67, p < .001$, in favor of the third grade (3rd-grade $M = 44.61$; 5th-grade $M = 42.04$). No statistically significant differences between grade levels were found on the Self-Concept as a Reader subscale. The means and standard deviations for each subscale by grade are presented in Table 5.

Reading proficiency level differences. Statistically significant differences were found among the above, on, and below grade-level reading proficiency groups on the Self-Concept as a Reader subscale, $F(2, 278) = 9.43, p < .001$. The Tukey HSD test revealed statistically significant differences across all reading ability levels, with the above grade-level group scoring the highest and the below grade-level group scoring the lowest. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 6.

Conversational Interview

The interview data were first analyzed with regard to responses that were relevant to the two constructs measured by the Reading Survey. Table 7 presents examples of interview responses reflecting the categories of self-concept as a reader and value of reading. The constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) was used to identify patterns in students' responses. Where appropriate, student responses to interview questions were tallied and frequencies were computed. These procedures yielded descriptive information about the influence of text type, school, and home on motivation to read.

Text Influences

Narrative reading. When asked to tell about "the most interesting story you have read this week," 2 third-grade children and 1 fifth-

Table 6. Mean Scores on the Self-Concept as a Reader and Value of Reading Measures for Above-Grade Level, On-Grade Level, and Below-Grade Level Readers

	Above-Grade Level (N = 124)		On-Grade Level (N = 135)		Below-Grade Level (N = 46)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Self-concept (Maximum score = 43)	30.19	(4.10)[a]	28.99	(3.74)[b]	27.41	(3.49)[c]
Value (Maximum score = 52)	43.76	(4.84)	43.25	(5.60)	42.57	(4.71)

[a] is significantly different from [b], $p < .001$. [b] is significantly different from [c], $p < .001$.

Table 7. Examples of Students' Comments Reflecting the Categories of Self-Concept as a Reader and Value of Reading

Self-Concept as a Reader

They (mom and dad) say I'm getting good at reading.

. . . and after a while I just got better and better and better.

. . . and after a while I would be really good at reading.

It's hard for me to read . . . I don't read actually, I just look at the pictures.

. . . there are some books I'm trying to read and I don't understand the words.

. . . I was one of the people that knew how to read . . .

. . . I'm on the top of good (*student is referring to reading ability*).

. . . Well, see I was always in the lower group because I didn't read that good, and I'd almost mess up on all the words. Like now they say that, in this class I'm in now, it's different levels, there's just books that they want us to read.

Value of Reading

Reading's pretty fun!

Well, I just love reading . . .

I have all kinds of books.

I buy some (books) with my allowance.

I beg my Grandma (to buy me books) . . .

My brother wants to sell (the book, The Phantom Toll Booth)! . . . I said, "You do that and I'm going to knock your lights out!"

Snow Treasure is one of the books you keep on reading and reading and never stop.

grade child first responded with expository text information. Three third-grade students were unable to describe a narrative reading experience; however, all fifth-grade students were able to do so. Two of the fifth-graders reported they had not read any stories "this" week but they were able to discuss reading done during the previous week.

In response to the request to tell the interviewer about the most interesting story they had read, 45 of the 48 students were able to describe in detail something they had read which they found interesting. Of the stories mentioned 25% were series books. In the course of telling about the most interesting story, 13% of the children spontaneously mentioned teacher influence (teacher had read the book aloud, teacher mentioned the book, etc.). Several children also spontaneously mentioned liking adventure, mysteries, and series books. When asked why the particular story they identified was "most interesting," children responded in terms of personal interest (25%), story action (23%), and one child mentioned the writing style of the author.

When the children were asked about their "most interesting" story, approximately 88% reported that they self-selected the book. Over 60% of these children reported that they chose the book from the classroom or school library. The primary reasons children offered for choosing the particular story were personal interest (15%), someone recommended it (10%), interest in a particular genre (10%), and fondness for series books (6%). Interestingly, only 10% reported that the "most interesting" story was assigned by the teacher.

Over 78% of the children reported having an "all time favorite book" and 10% mentioned series books as "all time favorites." Over 63% of the children were able to name and discuss a book by a favorite author. Additionally, 25% of the children named authors of series books as their "favorite author."

When asked, "Do you know about any books or stories you would like to read?" approximately 70% of the children were able to tell about such books. When asked why they wanted to read these books 46% mentioned interesting titles, 14% of which were series books. Children reported that they found out about these books from family members (19%), by reading other titles by the same author (13%), from browsing in the classroom or school library (8%), and from teacher (4%) and friends (4%).

Expository reading. In response to the initial probe to "tell about a time that you read to learn or find out about something . . . something important that you learned recently, not from your teacher and not from television," 5 third-grade and 2 fifth-grade children were unable to provide a description of a reading experience of an informational nature. One third-grader and 6 fifth-graders initially responded with renditions of narrative reading experiences. Of most interest was the finding that 5 third-grade and 6 fifth-grade students could not think of any expository reading they had done recently and responded with references to expository reading they had done in the previous grade, with 1 third-grade student referring to something he read in kindergarten.

Approximately 40% of the children were able to provide general information about their

expository reading, while only 30% were able to provide specific in-depth information about what they had read. Children reported that the informational reading they had done was of interest to them because it was about animals (30%), science/environment (20%), history (17%), and hobbies or sports (10%). Children reported that the sources of their informational reading were books (77%), encyclopedias (10%), and one child reported reading the newspaper.

When asked how they found out about their "most interesting" informational text, 62% reported they self-selected the reading material, while 18% reported it had been assigned by the teacher. Children who self-selected the material reported that it was chosen because of interest in the topic (27%), it was important to learn the information (17%), or it was a required assignment (4%).

Home Influences

When asked about where they read their "most interesting" story, children reported that they did the reading at home (56%), school (27%), and library (4%). When asked where they did most of the reading of their "most interesting" informational material, 50% of the children reported they read the informational material at home and 35% reported they did the reading at school.

Approximately 66% of the children reported that their favorite place to read at home was in their bedroom and 80% of these children reported keeping books there. When children were asked about how they acquired the books they own, 65% reported they received them as gifts, 16% received them through a book club, while 10% reported buying the books with their own money.

In response to the question, "Did you read anything at home yesterday?", 28 out of 48 children (58%) answered "yes." Of these 28 children, 25 were able to give specific titles or information about their home reading. Fifty-six percent of the children reported spending time reading for homework assignments. Approximately 45% of the children reported that they read for pleasure before going to bed at night.

Seventy-five percent of the children reported talking to family members about their reading. Parents were mentioned by 69% (with the mother being mentioned in the overwhelming number of cases), siblings by 15%, and others, such as grandparents and caregivers, were mentioned by 15%. Eighty percent of the children indicated that they were reading a book at home for fun at the time of the interview. Only one child reported owning no books or magazines at home, while 20% reported owning over 100 books, 42% reported owning more than 20, and 35% reported owning fewer than 20. Seventy-seven percent of the students reported owning magazines.

When asked to recall "good memories about learning to read," children told about pleasant and supportive reading experiences with parents (60%), teachers (21%), and others such as grandparents and caregivers (20%) and siblings (65). When asked about "unpleasant memories about learning to read" children shared experiences involving parents (10%) and teachers (4%). Finally, when asked, "Who gets you excited about reading books and

stories?", children identified parents (60%), teachers (23%), others such as grandparents and caregivers (27%), siblings (15%), and friends (15%). Approximately 12% reported that there was not anyone who got them excited about books.

School Influences

Most children (73%) indicated that they talked with someone at school about their reading. Of the 35 children who reported talking with others at school about reading, 69% indicated that they talked with friends, 15% talked with teachers, and 4% reported talking with others such as the principal and parent volunteers.

When asked, "Do you have any books in your desk right now at school that you are reading for fun?", over 70% of the students responded positively. All of the children were able to name the title of the book or provide specific information about it. Twelve of the children reported having more than one book in their desk for personal reading and 5 children specifically mentioned series books.

When asked about the reading of their "most interesting" informational materials, most of the children reported finding the material in the classroom or school library (63%). When asked to describe the reading they did throughout the school day, the children reported reading in the following areas: language arts/reading (75%), math (39%), science (23%), social studies (23%), and other areas such as music, physical education, and art (22%). When asked about reading during the school day, children reported that reading math (19%) and social studies (13%) texts was the most boring.

Over 20% of the children reported that there was time to read in the morning before school work was started, and 8% of the students reported that they had time to read when their work was finished. Most importantly, 88% of the children reported that there was some time during the school day when they could read whatever they wanted to read. Only 2 children reported doing reading in the school library during the previous day.

Discussion

One of the findings derived from this study involves the validity, reliability, and usefulness of the MRP instrument. There was abundant and confirming information across the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview about motivation to read. Children's responses on the Reading Survey corresponded with information provided in the Conversational Interview where students provided supporting information about their responses. While the Reading Survey items provided basic information about elementary students' self-concepts as readers and the value they place on reading, the Conversational Interview provided richer and fuller descriptions of the motivational reading experiences of elementary school students. (A refined version of the MRP can be found in Gambrell, Palmer, Codling and Mazzoni, in press).

The results of this study revealed developmental differences (grade) and proficiency level differences (above, on, and below grade-level) that are of interest with respect to reading motivation. As expected, proficiency level

differences were apparent on the Self-Concept as a Reader scale, with more proficient readers having more positive self-concepts than less proficient readers. This finding was not surprising, and is consistent with the work of other researchers who have documented the link between reading proficiency and self-concept as a reader (Henk & Melnick, 1995; McKenna & Kear, 1990). Of particular note, however, was the finding of significant differences between third- and fifth-grade students on the Value of Reading measure.

In this study, younger students viewed reading as having a higher value than did the older, fifth-grade students. This was a somewhat surprising finding, in that we had speculated that older students would be more aware of the value and importance of reading than younger students. While much of the research and literature related to elementary age students' reading motivation has focused on self-concept and general attitudes toward reading, few studies have focused on the views children hold about the value of reading. The findings of this study suggest that the two theory-based constructs of motivation that were explored in this investigation, self-concept and value, appear to be related to motivation in different ways. Self-concept as a reader appears to be more strongly associated with reading proficiency, while the value of reading appears to be more strongly related to age/developmental differences. The finding that children's perceptions of the value of reading diminishes as they grow older should be of concern to both teachers and researchers. This finding suggests that attention should be directed toward more fully understanding children's perceptions of the value of reading and the role that value perception plays in reading motivation.

Self-Concept as a Reader

Self-perceived competence is acknowledged to be a critical factor in learning (Bandura, 1989; McCombs, 1989; 1991). In this study, the results of the Self-Concept measure indicated that while most elementary students in this study reported that they are "very good readers" (47%), significant numbers of students do not perceive themselves as competent readers. For example:

- 45% reported, "I worry about what other kids think about my reading almost every day."
- 17% reported, "When I read out loud I feel embarrassed/sad."
- 17% reported, "I am an OK/poor reader."

Value of Reading

The results of the Value of Reading measure suggest that, in general, elementary students in this study view reading as being of high value. Several responses on the Value of Reading subscale, however, pointed to the fact that, for many children, reading is not viewed as a positive activity or as an activity of high priority, as revealed in the following responses:

- 17% reported, "I would rather clean my room than read a book."

- 14% reported, "I will spend very little/none of my time reading when I grow up."
- 10% reported, "People who read are boring."
- 10% reported, "My best friends think reading is no fun at all."
- 8% reported, "Libraries are a boring place to spend time."

These are the types of students that teachers become most concerned about in the classroom setting. In order to enhance their literacy development, their motivation to engage in reading and their perceived value of reading must often be addressed first.

This study yielded confirming evidence about the powerful influence of both self-concept and perceived task value on motivation to read. Taken together, the results of both sections of the MRP, the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview, yielded insights about young children's motivation to read that might help teachers to plan a motivating literacy environment. Four key features of young children's motivation to read were revealed—*access*, *choice*, *familiarity*, and *social interaction*.

Access

Recent research by Elley (1992) supports a strong link between reading achievement and book access. Both the Reading Survey and the Conversational Interview pointed to the importance of book access and book ownership in motivation to read. This study suggested that having many opportunities for book borrowing and having personal libraries at home appear to be important influences on motivation to read.

Book borrowing. Book access for the children in this study was primarily through borrowing from their classroom libraries, pointing to the importance of providing book-rich classrooms (Fractor, Woodruff, Martinez, & Teale, 1993; Morrow, 1992). Children also mentioned a number of other important avenues for obtaining books as these responses illustrate:

> . . . I got it from the YMCA bookmobile.
>
> . . . got it from the school library.
>
> . . . my teacher got books and she asked me to pick one.
>
> . . . I got it from the reading specialist . . . picked it from her collection of Bill Peet books.

Books as gifts and book ownership. Almost all of the children in this study reported having a personal library at home. Only 1 third-grader reported owning no books. When children were asked how they accumulated their personal libraries the overwhelming majority reported that they had received books as gifts from a wide range of individuals, primarily parents, but also mentioned were aunts, uncles, and grandparents. For instance,

> . . . they were gifts from family members.
>
> . . . I beg my Grandma (to buy them) . . . as gifts

. . . gifts from my uncle and grandfather . . .

. . . I got them as gifts for Christmas and birthdays.

On the Reading Survey both third- and fifth-graders indicated that receiving books as gifts was highly desirable. The interviews also revealed that children's book ownership is largely a result of receiving books as gifts. This finding suggests that there is a need for future research to explore incentive programs which give books as a reward (e.g., the 1st grade RUNNING START PROGRAM sponsored by Reading is Fundamental) and ways in which schools can promote book ownership through gift projects.

Two children reported having books "handed down" to them by older siblings or cousins.

. . . I trade with my brothers and people at school. I take anything I can get my hands on!

. . . My cousin had to move . . . she handed them down to me.

Book clubs. Book clubs and incentive programs were also mentioned by a number of children who reported owning larger numbers of books in their personal libraries.

. . . I got them from the Troll Book Club.

. . . I got them from Book It.

. . . I get 2 or 3 books from Troll Book Club each time.

Choice

The role of choice in motivation in general and reading motivation in particular is well recognized (Spaulding, 1992). The MRP conducted with these children consistently revealed that they are more motivated to read when they choose their own reading materials. When telling about the "most interesting" narratives and informational texts they had read, children consistently reported that they had self-selected these texts. Over 25% of the children indicated that they had chosen a book because a teacher or friend had recommended it, told them about it, or the teacher had read it out loud to the class suggesting an important relationship between self-selection (choice) and social interaction about books.

Familiarity

The importance of repeated experiences with books was revealed throughout the interviews as children talked about why they engaged in reading. Children described reading books previously read aloud by parents or teachers, reading books they had seen on television and in the movies, and reading series books which provide a particular kind of repeated reading experience. These repeated experiences may be closely linked to self-perceived competence in that they provide essential scaffolding necessary for successful reading experiences (Feitelson, Goldstein, Iraqi, & Share, 1993; Vygotsky, 1978). The following comments reveal the significance of repeated experience with text, even for older students.

. . . I like the Little Mermaid (movie) and I like reading it (the book).

. . . I saw it on Reading Rainbow.

. . . I read it after the teacher read it aloud.

. . . I've been reading a book for November and I'm going to still read it for December and it's called *Mouse and the Motorcycle*. We read it in school before . . . and my mom bought it (from book club).

. . . I want to read *Stuart Little* . . . my mom read it to us.

. . . I'm rereading that book (*White Fang*) and the bird book.

. . . I heard it on tape . . . my Uncle brought it for me.

One of the most frequently occurring themes throughout the interviews was the compelling nature of series books. Series books provide repeated experiences of a special nature with characters, setting, and general story structure remaining consistent and providing familiarity, while the plot provides new and challenging information. The following comments reflect the highly motivating quality of these books.

. . . Well, I'm reading *My Teacher Glows in the Dark* and it's really cool cause he's telling his friend what happened when his teacher took him to outer space. It's good and it's the sequel to *My Teacher is an Alien* and *My Teacher Fried My Brain*.

. . . third one I've read out of 15.

. . . they have a whole bunch of these books out like *Kristen*, *Molly*, and *Samantha* (American Girls series) . . . I really like reading those books.

. . . I like the Babysitters Club books.

. . . I have a whole set of them (referring to a series).

. . . I want to read more Boxcar children. I got the first one at the book fair.

. . . there's four to the series . . . I'm on the second.

. . . my sister had a set (of the series).

Social Interaction

The interviews supported the primary influence of social interaction on young children's motivation to read (Guthrie, Schafer, Wang, Afflerbach, 1993). Throughout the interviews children talked about hearing about books from teachers, friends, and parents as the following comments demonstrate.

. . . My friend Kristin was reading it and told me about it and I said, "Hmmm, that sounds pretty interesting."

. . . My friend told me about it.

. . . I got interested in it because the other group; I'm in the lower reading group and I heard the other group reading it so I checked it out in the library.

. . . I want to read those books . . . my teacher told me about them.

. . . I heard about them from my teachers . . . they read good books to us.

In addition to these four key features of literacy learning, the results of this study suggest another important finding. There appear to be important differences in children's motivation to read narrative and expository text. Almost every child in this study responded immediately and enthusiastically to the request to tell about "the most interesting story you have read this week." This was not the case when asked to tell about reading they had done which was informational in nature. Many students had difficulty thinking of anything they had read recently which was informational, and a large percentage could only refer to reading which had been done in previous years.

In a study that explored the role of text-type on children's engagement with text, Leal (1992) reported that elementary children found what she called "infotainment" books—books which are both informational and entertaining—more engaging than either narrative or expository texts. Recently, Pappas (1993) reported that even kindergarten children demonstrated a preference for information books. It was interesting to note, therefore, that in the present study, while children were not as responsive to requests to talk about informational types of reading, a few who responded readily to the request were excited and interested in sharing this information. When describing the pleasure and excitement she experienced from reading about a topic in an encyclopedia, one student said, "I don't know why, but I've always been the kind of person to want to, at the flash of a moment, get information . . . I just crave for information." This student linked her informational reading to her narrative reading on a particular topic. In describing her reading about World War II in the encyclopedia, she proceeded to describe a related book she had read. ". . . and I found out, more from a child's point of view (by reading the narrative book, as compared to the information text), . . . her best friend is Jewish and they're trying to get her away from the soldiers . . . you could see how the times were complicated . . . it was, . . . I don't know how to say it, . . . it was just tragic, you know? I like reading about characters, and how the authors take real life and put it into their own fiction." While the findings of the present study suggest that children are more responsive and interested in narrative text, it is clear that some children make intertextual links between narrative and expository text, have an understanding of the genre, and enjoy reading informational text. The reluctance with which children in the present study responded to the interview questions about informational texts suggests that future research is needed which will focus on motivational aspects related to young children's reading of expository texts.

It is worth noting here that in social and behavioral research, methodological decisions inevitably involve tradeoffs. In this study it was believed that because of the young age of the students, teacher administration of the survey instrument would be less intrusive and more ecologically sound. Since standardization and reliability might be a concern, these issues

were addressed through teacher training and explicit written directions on the procedures for administration. Future studies might consider observation of teacher administration of research instruments to detect deviations from the standard directions.

Summary

This study investigated the reading motivation of 330 students in third and fifth grade. These students completed the Reading Survey section of the MRP which consists of two subscales (Self-concept as a Reader and Value of Reading). In addition, a subset of 48 students participated in a Conversational Interview.

When the data were analyzed across grade levels, there were no significant differences between third and fifth graders on the self-concept subscale. The results revealed grade-level differences on the value of reading measure, with younger, third-grade children having a higher value of reading than the older, fifth-grade children. Proficiency level differences were also found, with more proficient readers having more positive self-concepts as readers than the less proficient readers. These results support past research on reading motivation and provide compelling evidence in support of the influence of the two factors explored in this study: perceived self-concept and perceived task value. In addition, the Conversational Interview revealed text, school, and home influences and linked motivation to read to four key features of literacy learning—access, choice, familiarity, and social interaction.

Finally, the MRP used in this study appears to be a valid and reliable instrument for assessing students' motivation to read. It provides teachers with a practical tool for the authentic assessment of children's reading motivation.

Author Note. We are indebted to the following principals who so graciously welcomed us into their schools to conduct this research: Penny Berg-Nye, Larry Cassell, Linda Long, and Judy Sherman. We would also like to thank the classroom teachers and the students who participated in the study, especially the 48 children who delighted us with their abundant enthusiasm and unique insights about reading motivation.

References

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 260–267.

Anderson, M. A., Tollefson, N. A., & Gilbert, E. C. (1985). Giftedness and reading: A cross-sectional view of differences in reading attitudes and behaviors. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 29*, 186–189.

Baker, C. D. (1984). The search for adultness: Membership work in adolescent-adult talk. *Human Studies, 7*, 301–323.

Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist, 44*, 1175–1184.

Burgess, R. (1980). *Field research: A sourcebook and field manual*. London: Allen & Uwin.

Coladarci, T. (1986). Accuracy of teacher judgments of student responses to standardized test items. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*, 141–146.

Corno, L., & Mandinach, E. (1983). The role of cognitive engagement in classroom learning and motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 18*, 88–100.

Corno, L., & Snow, R. E. (1986). Adapting teaching to individual differences among learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 605–629). New York: Macmillan.

Covington, M. V. (1985). The motive for self-worth. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education: The classroom milieu* (pp. 77–113). New York: Academic Press.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334.

Cronbach, L. J. (1988). Five perspectives on the validity argument. In H. Wainer & H. Braun (Eds.), *Test validity*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Literacy and intrinsic motivation. In S. R. Graubard (Ed.), *Literacy: An Overview by Fourteen Experts*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Denzin, N. (1970). *The research act in sociology*. London: Butterworth.

Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41*, 1040–1048.

Dweck, C., & Elliott, E. (1983). Achievement motivation. In E. M. Heatherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology; Vol. 4, Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 643–691). New York: Wiley.

Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 75–146). San Francisco: Freeman.

Egan, O., & Archer, P. (1985). The accuracy of teachers' ratings of ability: A regression model. *American Educational Research Journal, 22*, 25–34.

Elley, W. B. (1992). *How in the world do students read?* Hamburg, Germany: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Feitelson, D., Goldstein, Z., Iraqi, J., & Share, D. L. (1993). Effects of listening to story reading on aspects of literacy acquisition in a diglossic situation. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28*, 71–79.

Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating humans*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Fractor, J. S., Woodruff, M. C., Martinez, M. G., & Teale, W. H. (1993). Let's not miss opportunities to promote voluntary reading: Classroom libraries in the elementary school. *The Reading Teacher, 46*, 476–485.

Freud, S. (1951). *The psychopathology of everyday life*. New York: New American Library. (Original work published 1901)

Gambrell, L. B. (1992). Elementary school literacy: Changes and challenges. In M. J. Dreher & W. H. Slater (Eds.), *Elementary school literacy: Critical issues* (pp. 227–239). Norwood, ME: Christopher-Gordon.

Gambrell, L. B., Palmer, B. M., Codling, R. M., & Mazzoni, S. A. (in press). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher*.

Gottfried, A. E. (1986). *Children's academic intrinsic motivation inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Greaney, V., & Neuman, S. B. (1990). The functions of reading: A cross-cultural perspective. *Reading Research Quarterly, 25*, 172–195.

Guthrie, J. T., Schafer, W., Wang, Y., & Afflerbach, P. (1993). *Influences of instruction on amount of reading: An empirical exploration of*

social, cognitive, and instructional indicators (Reading Research Report No. 3). Athens, GA: NRRC, Universities of Georgia and Maryland College Park.

Hansen, H. S. (1969). The impact of the home literacy environment on reading attitudes. *Elementary English, 46*, 17-24.

Harter, S. (1981). A new self-report scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom: Motivational and informational components. *Developmental Psychology, 17*, 300-312.

Henk, W. A., & Melnick, S. A. (1995). The reader self-perception scale (RSPS): A new tool for measuring how children feel about themselves as readers. *Reading Teacher, 48*, 470-483.

Hoge, R. D., & Butcher, R. (1984). Analysis of teacher judgments of pupil achievement levels. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 777-781.

Ishikawa, K. (1985). Developmental study of school children's attitudes toward reading. *The Science of Reading, 29*, 89-98.

Johnson, C. S., & Gaskins, J. (1991). Reading attitude: Types of materials and specific strategies. *Reading Improvement, 28*, 237-242.

Johnson, D. D. (1973). Sex differences in reading across cultures. *Reading Research Quarterly, 9*, 67-86.

Kuhl, J. (1986). Introduction. In J. Kuhl & J. W. Atkinson (Eds.), *Motivation, thought, and action* (pp. 1-16). New York: Praeger.

Leal, D. J. (1992). The nature of talk about three types of text during peer group discussions. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*, 313-338.

Lepper, M. R. (1988). Motivational considerations in the study of instruction. *Cognition and Instruction, 5*, 289-309.

Maehr, M. L. (1976). Continuing motivation: An analysis of a seldom considered educational outcome. *Review of Educational Research, 46*, 443-462.

Marsh, H. W., Smith, I. D., & Barnes, J. (1983). Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the self-description questionnaire: Student-teacher agreement on multidimensional ratings of student self-concept. *American Educational Research Journal, 20*, 333-357.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

McCombs, B. L. (1989). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A phenomenological view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 51-82). New York: Springer-Verlag.

McCombs, B. L. (1991). Unraveling motivation: New perspectives from research and practice. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 60*, 3-88.

McKenna, M. C., & Kear, D. J. (1990). Measuring attitude toward reading: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 43*, 626-639.

McKenna, M. C., Kear, D. J., & Ellsworth, R. A. (in press). Children's attitudes toward reading: A national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly*.

Morrow, L. M. (1992). The impact of a literature-based program on literacy achievement, use of literature, and attitudes of children from minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly, 27*, 250-275.

Oldfather, P. (1993). What students say about motivating experiences in a whole language classroom. *The Reading Teacher, 46*, 672-681.

Pappas, C. C. (1993). Is narrative "primary"? Some insights from kindergarteners' pretend readings of stories and informational books. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 25*, 97-129.

Paris, S. G., & Oka, E. R. (1986). Self-regulated learning among exceptional children. *Exceptional Children, 53*, 103-108.

Parker, A., & Paradis, E. (1986). Attitude development toward reading in grades one through six. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*, 313–315.

Perkins, H. V. (1958). Teachers' and peers' perception of children's self-concepts. *Child Development, 29*, 203–220.

Phillips, B. N. (1963). Age changes in accuracy of self-perception. *Child Development, 64*, 1041–1046.

Pintrich, P. R., & DeGroot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 33–40.

Raynor, J. O., & Nochajski, T. H. (1986). Development of the motivation for particular activity scale. In D. R. Brown & I. Vernoff (Eds.), *Frontiers of motivational psychology* (pp. 1–25). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Roettger, D. (1980). Elementary students' attitudes toward reading. *The Reading Teacher, 33*, 451–453.

Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ross, E. P., & Fletcher, R. K. (1989). Responses to children's literature by environment, grade level, and sex. *Reading Instruction Journal, 32*, 22–28.

Saracho, O. M., & Dayton, C. M. (1991). Age-related changes in reading attitudes of young children: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Research in Reading, 14*, 33–45.

Schell, L. M. (1992). Student perceptions of good and poor readers. *Reading Improvement, 29*, 50–55.

Schunk, D. (1985). Self-efficacy and school learning. *Psychology in the Schools, 22*, 208–223.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Macmillan.

Spaulding, C. L. (1992). The motivation to read and write. In J. W. Irwin & M. A. Doyle (Eds.), *Reading/writing connections: Learning from research* (pp. 177–201). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Stevenson, H. W., & Newman, R. S. (1986). Long-term prediction of achievement and attitudes in mathematics and reading. *Child Development, 57*, 646–657.

Stipek, D. (1988). *Motivation to learn: From theory to practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tunnell, M. O., Calder, J. E., Justen, J. E., & Phaup, E. S. (1988). Attitudes of young readers. *Reading Improvement, 25*, 237–242.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review, 92*, 548–573.

Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 616–622.

Wigfield, A., & Asher, S. R. (1984). Social and motivational influences on reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 423–452). New York: Longman.

Winne, P. (1985). Steps toward promoting cognitive achievements. *Elementary School Journal, 85*, 673–693.

Winne, P., & Marx, R. (1982). Students' and teachers' views of thinking processes for classroom learning. *Elementary School Journal, 82*, 493–518.

Wittrock, M. C. (1986). Students' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 297–314). New York: Macmillan.

Appendix A

Information Sheet

Information Sheet

Note: The person filling out this form should be responsible for reading instruction at the third- or fifth-grade level.

School _____
Teacher's Name _____
Circle Grade: 3 5

We are looking forward to working with you as we study children's motivation to read. To help us get started, we would like to ask you to do three things.

1. Please check the program descriptor from the list below that best describes your classroom reading program. If you supplement your basic program by any other approach or material, please give a brief description on the line provided.

___ basal program
___ basal program supplemented by _____
___ children's literature
___ children's literature supplemented by _____
___ language experience
___ language experience supplemented by _____
___ other _____

2. List your students by reading level. Use your best teacher judgment to indicate whether the student is reading on grade level, above grade level, or below grade level.

Above Grade Level	**On Grade Level**	**Below Grade Level**
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

(continued)

Above Grade Level	On Grade Level	Below Grade Level

3. Now, indicated for each of the groups above, two highly motivated readers and two unmotivated readers.

Above Grade Level

Highly Motivated: _____ _____

Unmotivated: _____ _____

On Grade Level

Highly Motivated: _____ _____

Unmotivated: _____ _____

Below Grade Level

Highly Motivated: _____ _____

Unmotivated: _____ _____

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this form call Barbara Martin Palmer (301) 845-4120.

Appendix B

Self-Concept as a Reader Subscale

Name _____

HOW DO *YOU* FEEL ABOUT YOUR READING?

Sample #1: I am in _____.

- O 3rd grade
- O 5th grade
- O 8th grade

Sample #2: I am a _____.

- O boy
- O girl

---

1. My friends think I am _____.

   - O a very good reader
   - O a good reader
   - O an OK reader
   - O a poor reader

---

2. When I am in a group talking about stories, I _____.

   - O almost never talk about my ideas
   - O sometimes talk about my ideas
   - O almost always talk about my ideas
   - O always talk about my ideas

---

3. I read _____.

   - O better than my friends
   - O about the same as my friends
   - O not as well as my friends

---

4. When I come to a word I don't know, I can _____.

- O almost always figure it out
- O sometimes figure it out
- O almost never figure it out
- O never figure it out

5. When I read out loud I feel _____.

- O happy that I can read
- O embarrassed about how I read
- O proud that I read so well
- O sad that I can't read better

6. When I am reading by myself, I understand _____.

- O almost everything I read
- O some of what I read
- O almost none of what I read
- O none of what I read

7. I am _____.

- O a poor reader
- O an OK reader
- O a good reader
- O a very good reader

8. I worry about what other kids think about my reading _____.

- O every day
- O almost every day
- O once in a while
- O never

9. When my teacher asks me a question about what I have read, I _____.

- O can never think of an answer
- O have trouble thinking of an answer
- O sometimes think of an answer
- O always think of an answer

10. Reading is _____.

- O very easy for me
- O kind of easy for me
- O kind of hard for me
- O very hard for me

Appendix C

Value of Reading Subscale

Name _____

WHAT DO *YOU* THINK ABOUT READING?

Sample #1: I am in _____.

- O 3rd grade
- O 5th grade
- O 8th grade

Sample #2: I am a _____.

- O boy
- O girl

---

1. In my free time I would rather _____.

   - O read a book
   - O watch TV

---

2. I would like for my teacher to read books out loud to the class _____.

   - O every day
   - O almost every day
   - O once in a while
   - O never

---

3. I tell my friends about good books I read.

   - O I never do this.
   - O I almost never do this.
   - O I do this some of the time.
   - O I do this a lot.

---

4. My best friends think reading is _____.

- O really fun
- O sort of fun
- O no fun at all

5. Reading a book is something I like to do.

- O often
- O sometimes
- O not very often
- O never

6. Knowing how to read well is _____.

- O not very important
- O important
- O very important

7. People who read a lot are _____.

- O very interesting
- O interesting
- O not very interesting
- O boring

8. I would rather _____.

- O read a book
- O clean my room

9. I think libraries are _____.

- O a great place to spend time
- O an interesting place to spend time
- O an OK place to spend time
- O a boring place to spend time

10. I would rather have _____.

- O a new game
- O a new book

11. I think reading is _____.

- O a boring way to spend time
- O an OK way to spend time
- O an interesting way to spend time
- O a great way to spend time

12. In my house, I have _____.

- O no books of my own
- O a few books of my own
- O more than 10 books of my own
- O more than 20 books of my own

13. Other people in my house _____.

- O read a lot of the time
- O read some of the time
- O almost never read
- O never read

14. When I grow up I will spend _____.

- O none of my time reading
- O very little of my time reading
- O some of my time reading
- O a lot of my time reading

15. When someone gives me a book for a present, I feel _____.

- O very happy
- O sort of happy
- O okay
- O disappointed

Appendix D

References Cited for Reading Survey Item Generation

Instruments Referenced for Item Generation

Children's Academic Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (Gottfried, 1986)

Intrinsic Motivation Scale (Harter, 1981)

Literacy Activities Rating (Johnson & Gaskins, 1991)

Reading Attitude Survey (McKenna & Kear, 1990)

Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990)

Motivation for Particular Activity Scale (Raynor & Nochajski, 1986)

Bipolar Semantic Differential Scale (Schell, 1992)

Short Form Reading Attitude Survey (Tunnell, Calder, Justen, & Phaup, 1988)

Appendix E

Conversational Interview

Part A: Narrative Reading
Part B: Informational Reading

School: _____ Student: _____

INTERVIEW A

Hi _____. My name is _____. I'm interested in what people read and how they feel about what they read. I would like to talk with you about the reading you do in and out of school. I'll be tape recording some of what you say today. (*Turn on recorder.*)

[*Or if this is the second interview, say*: Hi _____. How are you today? I'm glad we have another chance to talk about reading. Just like last time I'll be recording some of what you say today. (*Turn on recorder for starred items.*)]

I have been reading a good book. I was talking with my husband about it last night. He also told me about something he was reading. We talk a lot about good stories we are reading. Today I'd like to hear about what you have been reading.

A. Specific Book Experience—Narrative

1. I'd like to hear about the most interesting story you have read this week (or even last week). Take a few minutes to think about it. (*Wait time.*) Now, I'd like for you to tell me about the most interesting story you have read lately.

[**Note:** *If response depicts an informational book, say*: Today I'm more interested in stories. Can you think of an interesting story that you read?]

Follow-up probes: What else can you tell me?
Is there anything else?

2. Why was this story interesting to you? _____
_____

3. How did you know or find out about this story?

___ assigned ___ in school _____
___ chosen ___ out of school _____

4. *If assigned (#3 above), ask*: What did your teacher say? _____
_____

If chosen (#3 above), ask: Why do you think you chose this story/book to read? _____
_____

5. Where did you do most of your reading (of this story/book)? _____
_____

B. General Reading Questions

1. Do you have a favorite place at *home* where you go to read? _____
_____

2. Did you read anything at *home* yesterday? _____ What? _____
_____

3. Do you ever talk to someone at *home* about the books you're reading? _____
Who? _____

4. Do you ever talk to someone at *school* about the books you're reading? _____
Who? _____
[**Note:** *If an adult is mentioned (i.e., librarian, teacher, volunteer), ask about friends.*]

5. Do you have any books in your desk right now at school that you are reading for fun? ___
What are they? _____
_____

6. Do you have any books at home right now that you are reading for fun? _____
What? _____
_____

7. Do you have books or magazines at home that belong to you? _____
About how many books? _____ About how many magazines? _____
Where do you keep them? _____
How did you get them? _____

8. Do you have an *all time favorite book* that you have read all by yourself? Not one that your mom or dad or someone else read to you, but one that you read all by yourself? _____
What is it? _____

9. Some people have a favorite author. Have you ever read lots of books by one author? ___
Who? _____
What books? _____

10. Some people have a favorite illustrator. Have you ever read lots of books by one illustrator? _____ Who? _____
What books? _____

C. Reader Knowledge

1. What kind of reader are you? (*Show cards.*) _____

2. What do you think you have to learn to be a better reader? (*Initial free response. If no answer, then show cards.*) _____
_____
_____

3. Do you know about any books right now that you'd like to read? _____
How did you find out about them?_____
_____

4. Learning to read is really important. I'd like for you to think now about when you learned to read. What do you remember? Do you have any good memories about learning to read? Could you tell me about them (who, when, where)? (*If no response, say*: Well, think about it for a minute.) Do you have any particularly unpleasant memories of learning to read? Tell me about them.

5. Who gets you interested and excited about books? _____
_____

Probe: Anyone else?

School _____ Student _____

INTERVIEW B

Hi _____. My name is _____. I'm interested in what people read and how they feel about what they read. I would like to talk with you about the reading you do in and out of school. I'll be tape recording some of what you say today. (*Turn on recorder.*)

[*If this is the second interview, say*: Hi _____. How are you today? I'm glad we have another chance to talk about reading. Just like last time, I'll be tape recording some of what you say today. (*Turn on recorder.*)]

We do lots of kinds of reading. Often we read to find out about something or to learn. I remember when my son was in the third grade, he read a lot of books about dinosaurs to find out as much as he could about them. Today I'd like to hear about what you have been reading.

A. Specific Books Experience—Informational

1. Can you think of a time when you read to learn or find out something? Think about something important that you learned recently, not from your teacher and not from television, but from a book. What did you read about? Tell me about it.

[*If response depicts a narrative, say*: Today I'm more interested in information books.]

Probes: What else could you tell me?
Is there anything else?

2. Why do you think this book/article was important to you?

_____

_____

3. How did you know or find out about this book/article?

___ assigned ___ in school _____

___ chosen ___ out of school _____

4. *If assigned (#3 above), ask*: What did your teacher say? _____

_____

If chosen (#3 above), ask: Why do you think you chose this book/article to read? _____

_____

5. Where did you do most of your reading (of this book/article)? _____

_____

B. Yesterday's School Reading

1. Now, let's talk for a little while about what you did yesterday in school. I want you to think about the *reading* you did *in school*. Let's start with the beginning of the school day. Tell me about what you remember reading.

Content Area	Whole/Part	Assigned/Choice	Reason
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

2. Was there any time during the school day that you could read whatever you wanted? ____
If so, what did you choose to read? _____
_____

3. I think you read a lot in school yesterday. Of all the things you read, which was the most interesting? _____
Why? _____

4. Which was the most boring? _____
Why? _____

C. Yesterday's Home Reading

1. Let's talk now about the reading you did at *home* yesterday. Did you read anything before dinner? _____ What? _____

2. Did you read anything after dinner? _____ What? _____

3. Did you read anything before bed? _____ What? _____

4. Did you do any reading for homework? _____ What? _____

5. Can you think of any other reading you did at home yesterday? _____ Tell me about it. _____

_____

6. Of all the things you read at home, which was the most boring? _____

_____

Why? _____

7. Which was the most interesting or important? _____

_____

Why? _____

Appendix F

Teacher Directions for Administration of the Reading Survey

TEACHER DIRECTIONS

Distribute copies of the questionnaire to your students.

Ask students to write their names on the space provided in the top right-hand corner.

Say:

I am going to read some sentences to you. I want to know **how you feel about your reading** (for the bear form) or **how you feel about reading** (for the parrot form).

There are no right or wrong answers. I really want to know how you honestly feel **about your reading** (for the bear form), **about reading** (for the parrot form).

I will read each sentence twice. Do **not** mark your answer until I tell you to. The first time I read the sentences I want you to **think** about the best answer for **you**. The second time I read the sentence I want you to fill in the space beside your **best** answer. Mark only one answer. Remember: Do no mark your answer until I tell you to.

Okay, let's begin.

Read the first sample item. Say:

Sample #1
I am in (*pause*) 3rd grade, (*pause*) 5th grade, (*pause*) 8th grade.

Say:

This time as I read the sentence, mark the answer that is right for you.
I am in (*pause*) 3rd grade, (*pause*) 5th grade, (*pause*) 8th grade.

Read the second sample item. Say:

Sample #2
I am a (*pause*) boy, (*pause*) girl.

Say:

Now get ready to mark your answer.
I am a (*pause*) boy, (*pause*) girl.

Read the remaining items in the same way (i.e., number _____, sentence stem followed by a pause, each option followed by a pause, and then give specific directions for students to mark their answer while you repeat the entire item).

NRRC National
Reading Research
Center

318 Aderhold, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602-7125
3216 J. M. Patterson Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742